

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17979

But this is utter nonsense. We know by their own statements that Communists are dedicated to dictatorship of the proletariat, which can be conveniently shortened to dictatorship, period. We know that in actual fact, privileged classes of gangsters operate Communist countries, and that these gangsters are ruthless, cunning, utterly self-serving, faithless, and unreliable. And we must not fall for their bunk—especially when they talk about agriculture.

Let's not forget that the Canadians have a poor climate for raising food, too. But they have managed to come up with huge wheat surpluses. Let's not forget that the Scandinavian countries have a northern climate and a Socialist bent, yet they manage societies of abundance.

Let's not forget that the Russians have had almost a half century to build an agricultural industry as well as a housing industry, consumer goods industry, steel industry, and armament industry, and so far they haven't matched us in any of these things. Certainly, they have had the same 18 years the Japanese and Germans have had to develop a food industry. But bread is in tight supply in huge Russia today, while over-crowded Japan is self-sufficient in rice—unbelievable as it may seem.

Let's face it and capitalize on it. Communism is a failure as a system. Democracy is a success; free enterprise is a success. Yes, we may have a thaw in the cold war, but communism is still dedicated to the destruction of capitalism, true democracy and liberty. Let's not rush to bail the Communists out of their troubles—food troubles or otherwise—unless it is to our real advantage. Let's keep our heads and remember that the last time we were all good friends, the Russians stole half of Germany, most of the Balkans, took a Japanese island, and declared they won the war by themselves. Since then, they have tried to run us out of Berlin; they have put a base at our back-door; and have threatened us almost without ceasing. It takes more than one swallow to make a summer. It should take more than one test ban treaty and one Canadian wheat deal to make a Communist a good guy.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY C. McPHERSON

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, yesterday, several Senators expressed their appreciation of the services of Harry McPherson, who has left the Senate and his position of general counsel for the Democratic policy committee, to enter service in the Department of State.

I wish to associate myself with all the things that were said about Mr. McPherson. He is one of the most gifted young men I have met in recent years. He was a very valued servant of the Senate, a man of character and integrity. Even when a Senator knew that his views did not coincide with those of Mr. McPherson, one trusted him implicitly in any matter of advice or in any matter of research.

He will be missed in the Senate. I extend to him my very best wishes for success in his new position.

SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield me 1 minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 1 minute on the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I am pleased to note the widespread support throughout the United States for selling our surplus wheat to Russia for gold or hard currency. The support in North Dakota comes from all shades of political thinking—conservative, middle-of-the-road, and liberal—from farmers, businessmen, professional men, and others.

At the present time, nearly all of the approximately 200 food commodities produced in the United States are available to the Russians; only wheat, cotton, and about two other farm commodities are not now available at world prices to the Russians.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial—from the Bismarck Tribune of October 5, 1963—entitled "Wheat Deal Considerations;" one—from the Fargo Forum of October 5, 1963—entitled "Wheat Won't Lift Nikita Off His Self-Made Hook;" and another—from the Fargo Forum of October 6, 1963—entitled "Law of Supply and Demand Spurs Wheat Sale to Russ."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune, Oct. 5, 1963]

WHEAT DEAL CONSIDERATIONS

As usual, irrational emotions cloud the issue in any discussion of such a matter as sale of U.S. wheat to Russia.

Although it is good and proper to do humanitarian deeds when such deeds are not in conflict with the national interest, the basic and main reason for selling wheat to Russia would be to benefit the United States—not Russia.

If we refuse to do something that might possibly benefit Russia even when we know it is certain to benefit this country more, we injure ourselves more than we aid the cold war enemy.

It has to be demanded that the wheat be paid for in gold, and that there be no side commitments of any kind, of course. U.S. agreement to a sale under any other conditions would amount to betrayal of this country's interests. That we could not approve.

But we have wheat to sell, and we want to sell it. If Russia wants our wheat, and is willing to deplete its gold reserves to get it, instead of buying it someplace else, it is hard to see how it could do anything but benefit this country. And that should be the No. 1 consideration in this as in every other international negotiation: If it's to be to our benefit, we go along; if it isn't, we don't.

[From the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum, Oct. 5, 1963]

WHEAT WON'T LIFT NIKITA OFF HIS SELF-MADE HOOK

German experts on Soviet economy differ sharply with Chancellor Konrad Adenauer

about the wisdom of selling wheat to the Soviet Union.

Shipments of grain and flour will not in themselves "lift Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev off his self-made hook," they say.

So far as the transactions are for cash or short-term credits, they say, they actually may complicate the Soviet leader's problems and increase the pressures for eventual political concessions to the West.

Only if the Soviets were granted long-term credits on generous conditions could Khrushchev achieve the kind of relief he seems to be seeking, says the well-regarded Soviet expert of the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung.

The argument of German experts is based on the premise that Khrushchev has been and will be compelled to sell Soviet gold in large quantities to finance his crash program for grain purchases.

The very speed at which this is being done is proving to be expensive.

Experts at Radio Free Europe in Munich point out that freight rates from Canada's St. Lawrence River to the Soviet Black Sea ports have risen by 25 percent in recent weeks as a result of the demand for shipping space.

Soviet gold sales in large quantities are serving meantime to depress the world price. Gold prices have fallen 4 cents an ounce on the London market since the end of August, a period in which the Soviets have unloaded some \$220 million worth of their hoarded stocks.

Soviet gold sales in September alone were about equal to their average annual sales since 1957.

More fundamentally, a writer in the scholarly journal East European Economy, points out two additional factors.

One is the gold probably actually costs the Soviets about $2\frac{1}{2}$ times the current world prices to produce. Before the Soviet ruble was boosted in value in 1961 the cost of Soviet gold may have been 5 times the world price, writes Michael von Berg.

For this reason the Soviets are desperately eager to pay for their free world purchases in raw materials, primarily in oil. But the market for Soviet raw materials in the Western world is decreasing.

The writer's second point is that the Soviets are compelled to rely more and more on gold to finance the imports of Western machinery and equipment, which still are essential to the ambitious industrial plans.

In their early phases the Communists had a very cavalier approach to the question of gold. Nicolai Lenin once boasted it was not important in a Communist economy.

Before his death Lenin was altering his views, and by Joseph Stalin's time the great importance of gold in Soviet dealings with the West was recognized. Since then the closest official secrecy has been maintained about Soviet gold production and stocks.

Berg agrees in his conclusion with that of the Frankfurter Allgemeine's expert.

In the economic competition between communism and the free world it is Moscow that is pressed for time—not the West.

[From the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum, Oct. 6, 1963]

LAW OF SUPPLY AND DEMAND SPURS WHEAT SALE TO RUSS

What a difference the law of supply and demand makes in trade relations between the United States and Russia. This Nation may soon OK the sale of wheat to Russia.

All kinds of reasons will be given as to why the United States should make such a sale. The Democratic reasons will be different from the Republican reasons. President Kennedy's reasons will be different from those of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, Republican prospect for the 1964 Presidential nomination.

October 8

Yes, there are all kinds of explanations, but when you boil out all of the political gobbledegook, there remains this simple economic explanation:

The United States has too much wheat and Russia has too little; in addition Russia has gold with which to pay for the wheat, and the United States is anxious to recover some of the gold it has been paying out in world trade circles in recent years.

Of course, the wheat deal is far from consummated, and the odds are that Russia will come up with some gimmick which will make the deal politically impractical for the Kennedy administration. The Washington Democrats aren't about to sell wheat to Russia if there is going to be a major political backlash from such a trade in the 1964 election year.

The statement by Senate Republican Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN that he is in favor of a wheat sale paid for by gold on the barrel-head doesn't bind the entire Republican Party or all its potential candidates for the presidency. For instance, House Minority Leader CHARLES A. HALECK hasn't taken a stand on the sale itself, but he has posed a series of questions which should be answered before a deal is made.

The wheat deal may look bipartisan at the start, if it is made, but if anything goes wrong, we can hear the "I told you so" chorus of Republican critics who are against any deal with the Russians for anything.

But the law of supply and demand has been in existence since long before the United States became a nation, and before communism took over Russia. The idea of getting gold for unneeded wheat is so inviting that many critics of Communist Russia now see nothing wrong with such a deal. As a matter of fact, any deal which would reduce the U.S. wheat surplus in return for an inflow of gold would be welcome.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have received a number of communications from persons who, I believe, are familiar with the farm problem in the Communist countries. The communications state that the farmers of the Communist countries are sabotaging the government by deliberately failing to produce food, for the purpose of bringing to an end the Communist domination. The letters I am receiving also state that by selling wheat to Russia, we would sabotage the efforts of the farmers of those Communist nations in their efforts to emancipate themselves.

We are, of course, motivated to a minor degree by humanitarian purposes in urging the sale of this food. We are also motivated by the prospect of obtaining gold for our country.

The decision which, I believe, ultimately must be made, is how we are best to insure the future life of our Nation, and how best we can induce the farmers of the Communist countries to continue their efforts to break down the entrenchment of the Communist governments.

A few days ago I stated my opposition to this proposal. My opposition is growing stronger, rather than weaker.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

HURRICANE AND SUFFERING IN CUBA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we have a very disturbing and perplexing problem of foreign policy in connection with the humanitarian aid that ought to go to the victims of the terrible storm that has been raging in the Caribbean. We are a religious nation. The overwhelming majority of our people are Christian. I believe that we have an obligation always to try to put into practice in the affairs of government our religious principles. I find it very difficult to see any moral justification for any policy that does not go immediately to the relief of the suffering of people, even though their governments may be our enemy. I cannot reconcile such a course of action with the teachings of Christ, in which I believe, and I do not share the view that we should wait for the government to ask us to help their people.

So on the religious-moral basis, I would that my Government were proceeding now with full speed to supply the many hundreds, if not thousands, of fellow human beings who are also the children of God, who are suffering untold agonies in Cuba as a result of the storm. The same is true of Haiti. We ought not to wait for Communist Castro to make any plea to us.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

If we wish to move beyond the religious justification for the plea that I am now making, in my judgment it also would be in the national self-interest of the United States, worldwide, in respect to our prestige, for I know of no more effective lesson that we could teach in regard to the superiority of the system of freedom over a system of enslavement than that free men practice their religious principles.

I hope that before the day is out the American people and the world will be reading that we are seeking to bring the relief of medicine, food, and supplies of sustenance to the thousands of Cuban people who are living in such an hour of agony at the present time.

Lastly, we must reach the people behind the Iron Curtain if we are ever going to help them lift the Iron Curtain that denies them access to the world. In my judgment, the best way to weaken communism is to reach people behind the Iron Curtain; and therefore, as a Christian, I suggest to my Government that in the present hour it not forget the religious basis of our form of government.

FIASCO IN GUINEA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the September 27, 1963, issue of the Washington Post there ap-

peared an article written by Mr. Rowland Evans and Mr. Robert Novak, entitled "Fiasco in Guinea."

This article points up the complete failure of our policy in regard to this country. On September 9, I submitted to the Senate a report calling attention to the manner in which, under our AID program, we were furnishing aviation fuel to Guinea while at the same time this country had made a deal with Russia to refuel their planes en route to Cuba. These planes were being refueled from the same tanks in which our foreign aid gasoline was being deposited. Yet in that instance, just as in this case, the State Department hid behind a cloak of secrecy to conceal the real facts from the American people.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Fiasco in Guinea," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, September 27, 1963]

FIASCO IN GUINEA

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

In the steamy West African Republic of Guinea, where the cold war is a daily occurrence, Uncle Sam has just fumbled a golden opportunity to score a few points.

Last spring American diplomats shouted from the housetops—and we reported—how a small American airline called Alaska Airlines, Inc., was replacing Soviet aircraft in Guinea. But until today it has been a well-kept secret that the deal has gone sour.

Alaska Airlines planes were grounded some 3 weeks ago. Although the United States is working discreetly to replace Alaska Airlines with a big American line, the Russians now are flying the commercial routes again. Furthermore, nobody knows whether a \$700,000 U.S. loan ever will be repaid.

That is bad enough. But intensive inquiry reveals a breathtaking amount of bureaucratic buck-passing. As usual, the bureaucrats seem less interested in solving the problem than in making sure they don't get the blame for it.

The story dates back to 1958, when Guinea became the first French African colony to win independence. Refused help by both France and the United States, Guinea turned to Moscow for long-term aid.

But Russians are even worse than Americans at administering foreign aid. Guineans are particularly displeased about how much it costs government-owned Air Guinea to operate four-engine turboprop Illyushins.

So, Guinea negotiated an agreement with Alaska Airlines to sell them less sophisticated aircraft, four-engine DC-4's and single-engine Lockheed.

When Alaska Airlines could not find private financing, AID—the U.S. foreign aid agency—bought \$700,000 worth of Guinean notes. In other words, Uncle Sam lent Guinea \$700,000.

Trouble began May 14, 2 weeks after the first DC-4 arrived, when it nosed into the ground during a landing. After that unhappy start, trouble multiplied until Air Guinea grounded the Alaska planes, citing safety reasons.

Alaska Airlines claims that Air Guinea is so infested with Communist-bloc personnel that life is impossible for an American line.

The State Department laughing off these ebarges as something strictly from Ian Fleming, puts most of the blame on Alaska Airlines—but will not give details.

All that is sure now is that the Government's attempt to escape responsibility by

17998

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 8

owned. Of course, the other towns affected will receive no relief from this property tax revenue.

I feel that the present law discriminates in its definition of "real property" and in the extent of its aid coverage following the sale of such property.

In many instances where there was a sale or disposal of Federal property, the program which caused the increase in workers and their families continues on and the burden on the schools and their facilities is in no way lessened by the sale.

This is certainly true in this case.

The amount of Federal aid, moreover, is markedly reduced without a corresponding increase in taxes assessed against the property sold.

In 1956 an amendment was inserted in Public Law 874 which stated that the provision of the law applied:

For 1 year beyond the end of the fiscal year in which occurred the sale or transfer thereof by the United States, any housing property considered prior to such sale or transfer to be Federal property for the purposes of the act.

This clause offers partial protection to school districts with a preponderance of "housing property," but offers no relief when the Government property sold is nonhousing. This is precisely what has happened in the sale of this property to the Electric Boat Co., in Groton.

As I have said, this sale has had an immediate and serious economic effect on the school budget of Groton and 20 surrounding towns. These towns and cities, dependent to a large extent on Federal aid to impacted areas, had no way of planning because the sale of these buildings took over a year to consummate.

Mr. President, situations of this type are, of course, not restricted to the State of Connecticut and they can and will occur in many towns and cities throughout the United States as the Federal Government is called upon to dispose of Federal nonhousing property at its installations.

Some might say that relief can be sought under subsection (f) of Public Law 874, "Adjustment for Certain Decreases in Federal Activities." A measure of relief may be possible to some of the towns affected but not to all of them. At the present time, even though the sale of this property took place almost a year ago, eligibility for aid under this subsection has not been determined as yet and the various school districts are suffering because of this further delay and uncertainty.

Of course there is no such relief provision under Public Law 815 and school construction plans for several towns have had to be curtailed because of reduced Federal school aid brought about by the sale of the property.

I feel that striking out the word "housing" and thus making all property eligible for relief extension and permitting the payment of aid benefits "for 1 year beyond the end of the fiscal year in which the sale or transfer occurs" is only simple justice and wise economics in that it provides for intelligent plan-

ning and lessens the overall impact of the property sale on the towns concerned.

I submit this amendment at this time and request and solicit the support of my colleagues for an affirmative vote on it.

I think it is an equitable and fair solution to this problem, and I earnestly hope that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon will look favorably on my amendment and accept it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I reply to the Senator from Connecticut, I wish to do two things. First, I should like to make brief comment on the procedural situation confronting us. Many of our colleagues have asked me what the schedule of amendments for the rest of the afternoon is. Some Senators have a very important engagement downtown at 4 o'clock. I have assured them that I will do all I can to protect their interests. I should like to ask now what amendments will be offered. I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] intends to offer an amendment. Does any Senator know whether the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] will press an amendment?

So far as I know at the present moment, the only amendment that remains is the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania. Therefore I should say that we shall probably be through by 4 o'clock. Of course, no one can predict what will happen, but I hope we may get through in time so that our colleagues can keep their downtown appointment.

Second, I promised to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. I yield 12 minutes to him.

Cuba

THE PROBLEM OF CUBA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the problem of Cuba is urgent. Ignoring it will not make it go away. It lies at the heart of U.S. and hemispheric security.

Communist Cuba is no mere nuisance beneath the notice of a great power like the United States. It is a menace, a privileged base for the systematic subversion of every free government in the Americas. It symbolizes our weak and vacillating foreign policy everywhere. It is the anvil on which is being shattered our image as a great and responsible nation dedicated to freedom.

I know that nothing bores so much as yesterday's crises, nor captures our full attention like today's new sensation. But Cuba is not just yesterday's crisis; it is today's crisis and unless we do something about it, it will be tomorrow's crisis—a crisis which we may not then be able to overcome.

Make no mistake about it, the situation is continuing and dangerous, and the hard facts are not being adequately presented to the American public.

We hear, for example, a great deal these days about Soviet fishing trawlers. There has been considerable discussion of their encroachments on nearby fishing grounds, but very little of the fact that many of them operate in and out of Cuba.

A recently issued report of the Subcommittee for Special Investigations of the House Armed Services Committee states: "More than a dozen seagoing Russian trawlers of the *Okean* class make regular round trips between the North Atlantic fishing banks and Cuba." The report further states that naval and Coast Guard witnesses had agreed in testimony before the committee that these ships "could be landing or picking up spies or saboteurs or smuggling military items and that this could be done with little chance of detection in the landing or picking up operations."

There are also reports of a Soviet subsidized Cuban "fishing fleet"—a fleet which grows larger as the supplies of fish available in Cuban markets grow smaller. Can this be a red herring fleet?

This past May 11, the Cuban Consolidated Naval Construction Enterprise reportedly announced that it had budgeted \$15 million to build 88 ships, 70 of which were to be of the Lamba 75 type. The Lamba 75, with a 29.5-ton cargo capacity and a 250-horsepower engine is an ideal vehicle for subversive operations.

Then there are reports of paratroopers being trained at sea, of a Russian tanker based at Georgetown, British Guiana, to supply fuel for Soviet and Cuban vessels in that area, of arms being transshipped through British Guiana, of Castro-inspired violence in Venezuela and Colombia, of Castroite guerrillas attempting to enter Bolivia, of training schools for subversion and revolution being set up all over Cuba.

On July 26 in a speech which received little notice in the United States, Castro proclaimed:

The duty of the revolutionaries, of the Latin American revolutionaries, is not to wait for the change in the balance of power to produce the miracle of social revolution in Latin America, but to take the fullest advantage of everything favoring the revolutionary movement and make revolutions.

Then this Soviet puppet practically pinpointed some of the targets, when he said:

And what are the political situations in these countries—Peru, Colombia, Argentina, Paraguay, Venezuela, Ecuador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Honduras, El Salvador? Complete lack of stability, where the governing classes no longer control. We know by experience, and by conviction, that every people that does what the Cuban people has done will have the decided support of the Soviet Union and all the Socialist camp.

Soviet and Cuban fishing fleets are obviously trafficking in a good deal more than fish in the Western Hemisphere's troubled waters.

Let us raise the curtain of silence, face the hard facts of Cuba, and the intrinsic relation of these facts to our whole sagging foreign policy.

Last October the Soviet presence in Cuba was branded as "unacceptable"; to this day, the Soviet occupation forces remain.

Last October, the continued existence in this hemisphere of an advance base of Communist imperialism was labeled "unthinkable"; today, the administration

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17997

investment in education is an investment in the future of our country. By adopting this amendment, we can make certain that all the children of America, regardless of their race, enjoy the benefits of this program, due them as a matter of right and justice.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds to thank my colleague from New York for his support, which is typical of the fight which he has been making in the Senate in the monumental struggle for civil rights. If the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] wishes to make a motion, I shall yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for the reasons I have already stated in the debate in answer to my friend from New York in opposition to his amendment, for the reasons set forth in the committee hearings, and in the light of the overwhelming majority vote in our committee against the Javits amendment, I move that the amendment of the Senator from New York be laid on the table.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to the committee amendment.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASEL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASEL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 35, as follows:

[No. 185 Leg. i
YEAS—54

Anderson	Hill	Moss
Bartlett	Holland	Mundt
Bayh	Humphrey	Muskie
Bible	Inouye	Neuberger
Brockwater	Jackson	Pastore
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Kennedy	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, Mo.	Russell
Cannon	Long, La.	Smathers
Church	Magnuson	Sparkman
Edmondson	Mansfield	Stennis
Ellender	McCarthy	Symington
Ervin	McClellan	Talmadge
Fulbright	McGee	Thurmond
Gore	McGovern	Walters
Gruening	McNamara	Williams, Del.
Hartke	Monroney	Yarborough
Hayden	Morse	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—35

Aiken	Douglas	Pearson
Allott	Fong	Prouty
Beall	Hart	Proxmire
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Randolph
Boggs	Nebraska	Ribicoff
Carlson	Javits	Saito-Tall
Clark	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Cooper	Keating	Simpson
Cotton	Kuchel	Smith
Dirksen	Lausche	Williams, N.J.
Dodd	McIntyre	Young, Ohio
Dominick	Mechem	

NOT VOTING—11

Case	Goldwater	Morton
Curtis	Johnston	Nelson
Eastland	Metcalf	Tower
Engle	Miller	

So Mr. MORSE's motion to lay on the table Mr. JAVITS' amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the motion to lay on the table was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I offer amendments to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 69, between lines 5 and 6, to insert the following:

(b) (1) Paragraph (1) of section 15 of such Act is amended in the third sentence by striking out "and (B)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(B) for one year beyond the end of the fiscal year in which occurred the sale or

transfer thereof by the United States, any property considered prior to such sale or transfer to be Federal property for the purposes of this Act, and (C)".

(2) The amendment made by this subsection shall be effective on and after July 1, 1962.

On page 69, line 6, to strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

On page 69, between lines 12 and 13, to insert the following:

(b) (1) Paragraph (1) of section 9 of such Act is amended by striking out "housing" in clause (B) of the third sentence.

(2) The amendment made by this subsection shall be effective on and after July 1, 1962.

On page 69, line 13, to strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

On page 69, line 17, after "shall" to insert a comma and the following: "except as otherwise provided."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Connecticut yield to himself?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, how much time would the Senator like?

Mr. DODD. About 5 or 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is in control of the time in favor of his amendment. How much time does he yield himself?

Mr. DODD. Seven minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the amendment would lessen the impact on school districts of the sale of Government-owned property to private interests.

My amendment would redefine the meaning of "real property" under Public Law 874 which presently offers relief to school districts 1 year beyond the sale of Government-owned housing property to private buyers. I feel this provision should apply to the sale of Government-owned industrial and nonhousing property as well.

The problem which this amendment remedies was originally brought to my attention by the sale, consummated last December, of a number of Government-owned buildings in the Electric Boat Co. compound in Groton, Conn.

The sale of this property had an immediate and devastating effect on the city of Groton and 20 other Connecticut towns where Federal impacted aid was based, in part, on this Government-owned property now in the hands of private owners.

The economic crisis was felt immediately, as anticipated. Federal aid was based on the attendance of schoolchildren of federally connected workers as of October 1962. The sale took place after many delays, changes, and modifications, and resulted in an immediate reduction in aid to be received.

Mr. President, it is readily apparent that this property now in the hands of the Electric Boat Co. will be taxed by the city of Groton. However, the tax assessed is not computed until the next tax year, and will not approximate the Federal school aid formerly received when these buildings were Government-

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17999

flatly refuses to disavow eventual coexistence with a Red-dominated Cuba.

Last October the President pledged the solemn commitment of U.S. honor, U.S. will, and U.S. policy to the goal of Cuba's liberation; yet Castro's Communist tyranny becomes more deeply entrenched with every passing day.

History may well record our time as one characterized by brave words and timid deeds unless we once again shoulder our responsibilities and go about the not always comfortable business of world leadership.

Ratification of the partial nuclear test ban treaty does not sweep away grievous problems such as Soviet Cuba.

Administration spokesmen answer public and congressional concern over Cuba with one stock debate stopper. What would you have us do, they ask, go to war? Discussion is then shrouded in a mushroom cloud of self-righteous horror. Yet there are alternatives, constructive alternatives short of war to our present course. Since mid-June my distinguished colleagues, Mr. MORTON, of Kentucky; Mr. ALLOTT, of Colorado, Mr. CURTIS, of Nebraska; Mr. MUNDT, of South Dakota; Mr. DOMINICK, of Colorado; Mr. HRUSKA, of Nebraska; Mr. BENNETT, of Utah; Mr. PEARSON, of Kansas; and Mr. SIMPSON, of Wyoming, have all offered on this floor not only specific criticisms of present policy but specific proposals for effective action short of war, action calculated to launch the process of Cuba's liberation from Castro and Soviet military occupation.

They include a proposal for formation of a provisional government around which all the forces of a free Cuba might rally; proposals for a leakproof pacific blockade against all strategic traffic; for a quarantine to isolate Cuba as a base for Communist subversion; for the imposition of tough penalties against all blockade runners; for preparations for the rehabilitation of Cuba after Castro and Soviet occupation; and for a no-quarter political and psychological offensive against Castroism and world Communist aggression—all reinforced by the unequivocal demand for an immediate end to the Soviet occupation of Cuba and, thus, of the Western Hemisphere.

The response to these proposals has been almost total silence. As far as the administration and its apologists are concerned, our discussion of alternatives to inaction have been entirely ignored.

How can we account for this silence—rationally, within the bounds of substantial evidence, and beyond the confines of sheer partisan advantage?

One explanation might run in terms of electoral politics—but its implications are almost too shocking to contemplate.

It is true though that despite weeks and months of prior warning, missile sites were "discovered" in Cuba only in late September 1962. This was followed by the hastily devised "quarantine" which was successfully mounted in October. The Soviets, eyeball to eyeball, blinked first—or was it a knowing wink—just in time for the 1962 congressional elections.

An administration bent on electioneering the promise of Cuban liberation next

year might well be impatient with solid proposals for Cuba's liberation and rehabilitation made this year and a damper on all serious debate and discussion would be its logical reaction. Are they being advised?

Let us put Cuba in the deep freeze until we can come up with big fireworks, with startling promises of 1965 action, to be unveiled in the fall of 1964?

I do not believe that this temptation will be implemented, since it would be so contrary to our continuing security. But what then is the explanation? Could it be that the administration is in truth as timid, indecisive, and vacillating as it seems to be? Cuba would not be the only case in point, it would simply be the most serious in a long list—a list including Laos, Berlin, the decline of the Atlantic Alliance, India's seizure of Goa, and the United Arab Republic's aggression in Yemen.

But the anvil on which our prestige and position are being shattered is Cuba.

For a great Nation such as ours to tolerate the armed intrusion of an expansionist power so close to its own shores cannot help weakening our position throughout the world.

Those who question our intentions in Latin America are certainly not reassured by our appeasement of Castro.

Those who question our resolution over Berlin cannot be reassured by our lack of resolution over Cuba.

Those who question our staying power in southeast Asia are not reassured by Cuba.

Those who question our intentions in the Middle East are not reassured by our accommodation with tyranny in Cuba.

We must recast our Cuban policy into the encompassing frame of the worldwide struggle with communism before we can fairly come to grips with all the issues which daily bedevil us. We must not be taken in by the mounting chorus of the experts, the so-called Kremlinologists, that because of the partial test ban treaty and Soviet troubles with Red China, Khrushchev is so affably ready to do business with us, that U.S. concessions are in order.

I have heard no offer from Khrushchev to tear down the Berlin wall.

I have heard no offer from Khrushchev to remove his occupation troops from Cuba.

I have heard no offer from Khrushchev for real and meaningful disarmament.

I have heard no renunciation by Khrushchev of the Communist goal of world domination.

Instead we hear talk of U.S. troop withdrawals which would weaken our position in Europe, of nonaggression pacts which would legitimize the Soviet's World War II conquests, and of some new-found respectability on the part of the butchers of Budapest.

Mr. Khrushchev's hand controls the cold war thermostat, and all he seems to have to do is tap it up a degree or so and we glow as if bathed in the sunlight of a new era. Personally, I do not believe this sun will burn so warmly as to give us a lasting tan.

It is true that there have been changes in Soviet tactics, postures, and

images. The time and mode of our "burial" has possibly been altered. But who can soberly conclude that the grave has been filled in? The Soviet Communist Party declared in its reply to Chinese Communist criticism published in Izvestia this past July 14: "We fully stand for the destruction of imperialism and capitalism. We not only believe in the inevitable destruction of capitalism but are doing everything for this to be accomplished as soon as possible."

Is there more than one explanation of this declaration of policy?

Yet, so many of our officials and opinionmakers walk and talk amidst the delusions of their own inflated hopes, apparently assuming that our roadmaps for the future and Khrushchev's are interchangeable.

Though some of the milestones, such as Cuba, seem to be all too similar and all too dangerous for the United States, our desired destinations are still poles apart. The clash of basic principles, whether we wish to recognize it or not, is still very real and this fact must be reinserted into our strategic calculations before we relax ourselves into Mr. Khrushchev's burial ground.

We cannot make the hard decisions required of U.S. foreign policy on the basis of talk of a "good atmosphere" or a "new climate." One observer as termed this the science of "meteorological diplomacy." Aristophanes depicted similar political follies as "Cloudcoocooland."

I have always been intrigued by the mysteries of the universe, but when it comes to the diplomacy of the United States, I believe that the basis should be eternal principle and national interest—not stargazing—and certainly not Red stargazing.

To wait is to suffer later. To plan—and to act upon a plan—should be the order of the day.

Let us delay no longer on the menace of Cuba, 90 miles near. Let us give serious consideration to the proposals which have been offered here in the Senate, and let us hope sincerely that our foreign policy makers will stop ignoring serious proposals for our security and will formulate now a course of real and meaningful action in the national interest.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I compliment the Senator from Pennsylvania upon his speech with respect to the Cuban question and for calling the situation to the attention of the Senate again. There is no question, as shown by events, that the Cuban question is still foremost in the minds of the American people. Until the administration has spelled out a policy for the Nation and gives indication that it has such a policy and will pursue it, the people will be left in a quandary concerning our purposes and aims in Latin America.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his remarks.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

18000

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 8

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wish to add my commendation of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I commend him particularly for raising the question of fishing boats, which the Russians obviously are using, in my opinion, for the sole purpose of mapping the underwater territories off our coasts, for military use at a later date.

I have spoken on two occasions about the military buildup in Cuba. To me, it is extremely serious. Information is reaching us constantly, from a variety of sources, concerning this problem. One of the better articles I have read is contained in a column entitled "Huge Soviet Missile Complex in Cuba," written by Daniel James, and published in the Denver Post of September 17, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUGE SOVIET MISSILE COMPLEX IN CUBA

(By Daniel James)

WASHINGTON.—Russian guided missiles are still in Cuba some of them secreted in tunnels located in the Province nearest the United States, Pinar del Rio, according to sources inside Cuba.

The Russians are said to have dug five big tunnels at La Gobernadora Hills, near the main Cuban base at Mariel, in Pinar del Rio. It was at Mariel, just down the coast from Havana, that Khrushchev landed most of the missiles that precipitated the crisis last October.

The La Gobernadora tunnels are 105 feet wide—wide enough for two-way traffic—and have reinforced ceilings 30 feet high. A Castro army lieutenant who has defected, and who personally toured the tunnels during their construction, reports that at least two of them penetrate La Gobernadora for a distance of 6 miles.

One tunnel has been air-conditioned for the storage of nuclear warheads, and another equipped with refrigerating equipment for storing liquid oxygen used for ballistic missiles, according to sources inside Cuba.

Furthermore, add those sources, electrical systems have been installed at the nearby base of Meseta de Anafe, and those systems are in turn connected with the guided-missile centers at La Gobernadora as well as the big horseshoe-shaped military complex around Havana.

Pinar del Rio, it should be kept in mind, commands the Florida Straits. It has become the site of a great new Soviet military complex, say informants recently out of Cuba, with Russian Army GHQ located at La Gobernadora.

Another part of western Cuba where missiles are reportedly being stored is the Isle of Pines, just across the Gulf of Batabano from Pinar del Rio.

Fresh information indicates that the main Soviet installation on the Isle of Pines is at the Bay of Siguanea, and is manned by an estimated 2,000 Soviet soldiers and technicians armed with the following:

SAM air-to-ground missiles, land-to-sea missiles, underground strategic missiles, Komar rocket-launching vessels, plus such conventional weapons as tanks and artillery.

Also at Siguanea, according to underground sources, is a large submarine base under construction. It is said to consist of sub pens, still in construction, similar to those built by the Germans at their famous Kiel naval base during World War II.

The Soviet military complex in Pinar del Rio is, literally, so complex that the Rus-

sians had to build an intricate communications system to maintain contact with all their forces there. The system was built underground, it is said, and connects La Gobernadora with these other bases: San Julian airbase (MIG 21's), San Diego de los Banos, Soroca, Villanueva, Gramma, Finca Sust, and Meseta de Anafe.

"Pinar del Rio has been converted into one immense Soviet military camp," claim resistance leaders in Cuba.

A Russian military construction-supply center near Mariel alone extends for almost 3 miles, says a freedom fighter now in the United States, Gustavo Pernas Calva. "It is visible to any traveler from Havana to Pinar del Rio."

Mariel itself is wholly under Soviet military control, according to a man who formerly belonged to the office of the Chief of Staff of the Cuban Navy, Juan Guerra Fernandez. He reports that about 1,200 Cuban Navy personnel were discharged from Mariel recently and replaced by Russians—a move that completed Soviet control of the base.

One purpose for that control is that the Soviets are intent on protecting their great construction-supply center nearby, which consists of foundries, a cement plant, and a thermoelectric plant in the final stages of construction.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by my distinguished senior colleague from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]. He has presented to the Senate a real problem, which affects not only the Groton and New London area of Connecticut, but other areas, as well, which might be similarly situated. The amendment is worthy of the support of all Members of this body. I hope the amendment will prevail.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7179) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 11, and 27 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 to the bill, and concurred therein, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 2436) to amend section 101 (18) of title 38, United States Code, to permit the furnishing of benefits to certain individuals conditionally discharged or released from

active military, naval, or air service, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 2436) to amend section 101(18) of title 38, United States Code, to permit the furnishing of benefits to certain individuals conditionally discharged or released from active military, naval, or air service, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Georgia desires to call up a conference report. I yield to him, with the understanding that the time will not be charged to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7179) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 7, 1963, pp. 17909-17910, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the committee of conference agreed on appropriations totaling \$47,220,010,000 for the various military programs and activities of the Department of Defense, exclusive of military construction, family housing, civil defense, and military assistance. This total is \$119,697,000 under the Senate bill, which totaled \$47,339,707,000; and \$138,001,000 over the House bill, which totaled \$47,082,-009,000.

The Conference Committee total of \$47,220,010,000 is \$1,794,227,000 under the budget estimates of \$49,014,237,000, and \$1,130,072,500 under appropriations totaling \$48,350,082,500 for fiscal year 1963. However, when the 1963 appropriation is adjusted to exclude \$467,300,000 provided for the support of military family housing, which is not included in the pending bill, the decrease under appropriations for fiscal year 1963 is \$662,772,500.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at conclusion of my remarks a tabulation giving the amount of the 1963 appropriation, 1964 budget estimate, House allowance, Senate allowance and con-

18058

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 8

final letter from the editor, dated September 14, in which he recalls that:

The Russians, during the October 1962, crisis, demonstrated that they were completely unwilling to escalate any conflict over Cuba into nuclear war. Yet, after snatching defeat from the jaws of victory then, spines have not stiffened in Washington where Cuba is concerned.

Although the Cuban Information Service is no more, I am pleased to announce that the activities of Mr. Carlos Todd will not cease. His prose will soon emanate from a friendly European country and will continue to provide inspiration and information to all Cubans fighting underground and in exile awaiting the day when sanity and the Monroe Doctrine will surplant the New Frontier and its doctrine of retreat.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS PAINFUL TRUTH IS REVEALED BY MIAMI'S "TRUTH ABOUT CUBA COMMITTEE"

YEARLY COST OF CUBA'S COMMUNISM TO THE UNITED STATES

U.S. citizens' losses deducted in taxes prorated 4 years, \$125 million.

U.S. Government's property losses prorated 4 years, \$25 million.

Yearly tax loss in Cuban trade, \$25 million. Cost to U.S. taxpayers in increased sugar prices yearly, \$784 million.

Half of yearly cost of Alliance for Progress, \$1 billion.¹

MAINTAINING CUBAN REFUGEES, YEARLY

Bay of Pigs invasion, \$40 million.

Prisoners' ransom, \$58 million.

Prorated over 4 years—annually, \$23,250,-000.

Total yearly cost of Cuban communism to U.S. taxpayers, \$2,057,250,000.

Loss of U.S. trade with Cuba amounts to \$450 million, annually. Loss in production payrolls is incalculable. Money cannot buy the tremendous loss in prestige in the hemisphere.

It is estimated that the Russians spend \$400 million a year to support their Cuban colony. It is costing the United States over five times as much. Bear this in mind the next time anyone claims that the way to get rid of communism in Cuba is to make it too expensive to maintain. Too expensive for whom?

A LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

This Cuban Information Service published its first issue on November 3, 1960. Since that time, we have endeavored, to the best of our ability, to provide our recipients with news of the truth about Communist Cuba and of the rising Red tide that threatens to engulf the Latin American nations.

Editorially, our sole purpose has been to work for the freedom of our country; and, in doing so, to attack anything and anybody who pretended to delay or preclude the day of Cuban liberation.

The CIS was never intended to be a profit-making organization. It was distributed gratis to over 700 newspapers and 1,000 radio and TV stations scattered from Alaska to Patagonia. We sent it free to college and university libraries, members of the faculty, student organizations, the Washington diplomatic corps, some Senators and Congressmen, other governmental figures, labor unions, religious institutions, etc., etc. The

CIS found its way to Great Britain, West Germany, Spain, Austria, Italy, the Philippines, France.

It is very difficult to obtain the confidence of people who receive something gratis. Anything that is free, is looked upon with suspicion. Yet in these 3 years, we managed to prove to the press and individuals in over 27 countries that our news sources were sound and the items we published trustworthy. Never once have we wilfully published a falsehood, and a rumor was always classified as a rumor. Our editorial policy, like all editorial policies, was strongly subjective. As far as our resources permitted, we tried to fight for the liberation of our country. We shall never cease to do so.

That this manner of procedure was successful is proven by fat scrapbooks, which contain quotations from this CIS in newspapers throughout the United States and Latin America, sometimes with credit, and sometimes without allusion to the source of the information presented. At all times, our only concern was to get the message across; and, while it is comforting for the ego to obtain a personal mention, the matter of paramount importance was to disseminate information and opinion with or without credit.

As editor of this CIS, I have been personally attacked by the Cuban Communist press on several occasions. The CP Havana daily Hoy and its sisters, Revolucion, employed the grossest language in referring to my person. I was accused of being a Fascist, a lackey of the imperialists, a reactionary, a counterrevolutionary, a drunken playboy, and—the supreme smear—a homosexual. Havana's weekly Bohemia dedicated an entire article to my activities. Communist newspapers in Latin America lavished insulting prose attacking me personally. But then, I have also been under the fire of the New York Times and the New York Post, as well as the Moscow publication Trud.

It is comforting to know that the comrades spent so much time, effort, paper, and ink to attack me. They rarely engage in a campaign of discreditation unless they feel that a person is doing them some harm, no matter how small.

And now, with this issue, the CIS must cease publication. The reason is very simple: While we have received generous contributions from many individuals who received this service, their vital aid was not enough to balance the goodly number of news media and institutions which received the CIS gratis.

I personally, cannot continue to work indefinitely without remuneration. Few people can, unless their name happens to be Onassis. Responsibilities to my dependents make it impossible for me to do so. Nevertheless, no matter what I do or where I go, I shall endeavor to contribute what I can to the cause of Cuban freedom.

I wish to thank the many who spontaneously offered financial help; and the many in the United States and in Latin America who, when things looked blackest for our beloved Cuba, wrote letters of encouragement that served to make a man feel that his work was of some use, no matter how small.

I also wish to thank those here, in Miami—Cubans, and Americans who formerly resided in Cuba—who willingly volunteered their services for the weekly chore of assembling, stapling, folding, stamping, and mailing the CIS. Without their invaluable aid, we should have been hard put to get CIS out in the mails.

This CIS predicted, long before it actually became evident, that Brazil would turn toward communism and that the comrades had heavily infiltrated the government of that country; that Cheddi Jagan and wife Janet began the same process in British

Guiana well over 2 years ago; that Juan Bosch is leading the Dominican Republic down the same path to ruin; that Communist terror in Venezuela would intensify following the same plan employed by Castro.

We predict here that this is only the beginning; that all of Latin America will fall into Communist hands, unless the United States takes firm action against the Havana regime of Fidel Castro; and that the Communist conquest of the Southern Hemisphere will become fait accompli in less than 10 years, quite possibly in 5.

The Government and the people of the United States have not yet understood that the Communist offensive in Latin America is an attack on the United States, and not an internal affair between Communists and their opponents in South and Central American countries. The main enemy of communism is here, in this country; and all victories gained by the Reds in the hemisphere are victories against the United States of America.

We fully agree with the "Soliloquy" of Dr. Emilio Nunez Portuondo and feel that there is much to be explained in the strange actions of all Western governments—certainly including the United States—and their reluctance to take one single effective action against Communist Cuba.

The Russians, during the October 1962 crisis, demonstrated that they were completely unwilling to escalate any conflict over Cuba into nuclear war. Yet, after snatching defeat from the jaws of victory then, spines have not stiffened in Washington where Cuba is concerned.

It is, as Dr. Nunez says, all very mysterious. And we ask ourselves, what would the United States have done if Hitler's Nazi legions had established a formidable "Festung Cuba" under American noses, in 1940. Ah, how different matters would have been then.

Those who are more concerned with the welfare of this country than with political victories, those men who represent the real profiles in courage of our day and age, may yet turn the tide of public sentiment and sound the alarm bells of freedom.

For unless the United States of America is willing to accept the responsibilities and the risks attendant to all power, that power will eventually dribble through the hands of the men who enjoy its privileges, but are not willing to fight for its continuance, against a deadly foe who is determined to destroy this country at all costs. "We will bury you," said Nikita Khrushchev. And, by Lenin, unless the inexorable, worldwide advance of communism is halted and rolled back, so they will.

RESOLUTIONS OF OREGON AFL-CIO CONVENTION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the 8th annual convention of the Oregon AFL-CIO was recently concluded. This organization, which has been responsible for many progressive and forward-looking programs in the State of Oregon, adopted resolutions putting the organization on record in support of a number of major issues which now confront our country.

One of the resolutions called upon Congress to give prompt and favorable consideration to legislation which would provide hospital insurance coverage to the elderly under the social security system. The resolution points out that some 18 million persons 65 years or over are in need of assistance in securing health care benefits such as those provided by the King-Anderson bill.

¹The committee estimates conservatively that at least half the cost of the \$2 billion spent annually in the crash program of the Alliance for Progress is due to the existence of Communist Cuba.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18057

of bank organization is not an end in itself but merely a means to an end, which is providing the best banking service possible to industry, commerce, and the public generally.

Whether or not we agree with the present branching arrangements in our own or another State, and whether or not we feel competent to revise the branching laws of our own or another State, I think we must not overlook the principle laid down in the McClellan Act in 1927—that the branching arrangements of national banks should follow those prescribed by State law in a particular State. This rule is essential to the transfer of banks from Federal to State or from State to Federal charters. Last year, in reporting such a bill, which became Public Law 87-721, I said, "The existing law as to the retention of branches in cases of conversion, consolidation or merger operates as a deterrent to State banks converting into national banks in certain States, and hence is inconsistent with the dual banking system which contemplates that State banks should be able to convert freely into national banks and vice versa."

The importance to the dual banking system of the ability to convert from one jurisdiction to another also gives strength to the view that national banks and State banks should have substantially the same powers and limitations, with respect to investments, trust powers, and the like. It is not, of course, necessary that these powers and limitations be identical, but if there are any wide discrepancies, conversion from State to national charters or vice versa would not be possible.

The dual banking system can provide adequate facilities for commerce, industry, and the public only if each of its two parts is strong and vigorous. This poses challenges both to the Federal Government and to the States. But can the Federal Government give needed control and assistance to achieve Federal objectives, without taking over control and responsibility from the State banking authority? Can the States provide responsible and effective State banking systems, able to stand on their own feet without reliance on Federal crutches? I believe they can.

This brings us to consider two major Federal institutions to which many State banks belong—the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The Federal Reserve System has been given vast powers to regulate the flow of bank credit and money in order to promote economic growth and stability and is a remarkable combination of Federal, State, and private elements. The Board of Governors, which is generally held to be independent of the executive branch and is usually described as an arm of the Congress, consists of Governors who are given nonrenewable 14-year appointments subject to confirmation by the Senate and who can only be removed for cause. They are in no respect members of any particular administration, but are intended to provide "a fair representation of the financial, agricultural, industrial, and commercial interests, and geographic divisions of the country." The Federal Reserve banks, with stock owned by member banks, have a degree of independence from the Federal Government, and the member banks participate in the election of the presidents and directors of the Federal Reserve banks.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was created in 1933 to make sure that demand deposits would continue to serve as the Nation's principal monetary supply by means of the insurance of individual deposits in the Nation's banks. FDIC has built up a huge reserve fund out of premiums paid by the many insured banks, and it now seems hard to believe that the commitment of the Federal Government to support this insurance will ever be needed. FDIC is given

authority to examine and supervise insured non-member State banks in order to provide additional protection against banking practices which might prejudice a bank's deposits and make it necessary to draw on the insurance reserve.

Your proposal that the same Government agency should have the power to pass on the insurance of deposits in new National as well as new State banks is worthy of consideration.

The duties and powers of the Federal Reserve Board and the FDIC are broad and sweeping. They must be in order to carry out their functions. But neither they nor the State member and insured banks nor the State bank supervisors should ever forget for one moment that the State banks are chartered by the States, and are operated under State laws, and are responsible first and foremost to the officials of the States which created them.

This association was formed more than 60 years ago for the purpose of providing a place for supervisors of State banks to discuss their problems, and to increase the usefulness and efficiency, and to promote the general welfare of State banks. I understand that the latest step in this program has been the decision of this association to establish a school for the training of State bank examiners. This seems to me a most desirable undertaking. Bank supervision begins with the bank examiner, and in order to carry out fully their responsibilities under the dual banking system, each and every State banking department must have a careful and well-trained and adequate staff of bank examiners. I am sure that the establishment of the association's new school for training examiners will prove to be a great step forward for the dual banking system.

The dual banking system can provide the banking services needed by business and the public only if both parts of the system are strong and effective. We must remember that, while the dual banking system has two parts, it is a single system. Judge Bynum's remarks about the three branches of the Federal Government are applicable to the dual banking system—the National banks and the State banks must firmly maintain the essential powers belonging to each of them, but they must always act together as one brotherhood, with mutual toleration, in order to carry out their common trust. And they must work together for the preservation of American constitutional liberty within the framework of a system of private enterprise.

Cuba
CUBAN INFORMATION SERVICE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I take the Senate floor to eulogize a victim of American duplicity and indecision.

On September 14 a modest green covered offset publication originating from an address on Ponce de Leon Boulevard in Coral Gables, Fla., printed its 144th and final edition.

The death of this amazing literate fact sheet was viewed with mixed emotions. In Miami, in more than two dozen countries, in myriad newspaper offices and private homes throughout the United States, there was regret and surprise. But there can be no doubt that the death of Carlos Todd's Cuban Information Service elicited a satisfied sigh from the administration, for this unpretentious publication had for nearly 3 years committed the unpardonable sin of telling the Cuban story as seen from inside that miserable island. The facts carried in the Cuban Information Service almost continuously contradicted the hackneyed blandishments of

administration spokesmen, which in itself speaks well for the journalistic prowess of Editor Todd.

Carlos Todd, it should be pointed out, brought an excellent set of credentials to Coral Gables with him. He was run out of Cuba and his post as columnist in the Havana Times by no lesser a Communist than Fidel Castro. The "Cult of Fidel" could not stand the searing revelations of Mr. Todd's editorials when it became apparent that Castro's strings were pulled by Moscow and his peoples' revolution was nothing more than a Soviet manipulated guerrilla war.

Mr. Todd was not just a refugee when he landed in Miami. His reputation could have opened the door to any one of a dozen top newspaper positions, but this man sought not a sinecure. He chose instead to combine his fervent desire for a free Cuba with his knowledge of Castro's communism and his broad journalistic background to organize his own branch of the "Pen and the Sword" which may eventually free the sovietized nation. Mr. Todd's efforts created the "Cuban Information Service" which would have seen its third anniversary November 3.

The gentleman is a lecturer of no mean répute. He articulates in impeccable English. He has an analytically perceptive mind which can penetrate morasses of governmental verbiage and grasps the saliences. However, he is not given to extravagant language as his publication revealed. He employed a sardonic sense of humor as he brought the issue of Cuba and the administration's duplicity into sharp focus. But now, partly through the simple facts of economic life and because of the pressure exerted on him by the administration, the "Cuban Information Service" has gone the way of several score other papers whose editors in exile ruffled the wrong Federal feathers.

As an example of the services provided by the "Cuban Information Service," I should like to have two excerpts printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The first insertion, from the August 24 issue, could well be called the "Painful Truth About Cuba." It contains revealing statistics, pointing out that Cuba, which the United States hopes will prove an unbearable economic burden on the Soviet Union, is indirectly draining the United States of five times as much as the beachhead is costing Khrushchev.

These figures are attributed to an organization called the "Truth About Cuba Committee." However, I am informed that in round numbers they are quite accurate.

The first portion of the table, "Yearly Cost of Cuba's Communism to the United States," is broken down into roughly eight divisions which puts the total annual cost of Cuban communism in U.S. taxpayers' dollars at \$2,057,250,000.

Other data reveals that the loss of U.S. trade with Cuba amounts to \$450 million annually and that all in all Cuba, operating with impunity only 90 miles from the United States, is a far greater burden in dollars than it is in rubles.

I should like also to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks Mr. Todd's